UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/538,012	03/29/2000	Carole Dulong	42390.P6156	6257

7590 12/18/2002

Thomas C Webster
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER	
COLLINS, SCOTT M	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2183	

DATE MAILED: 12/18/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/538,012	DULONG, CAROLE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Scott M. Collins	2183	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 March 2000, 19 June 2000* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *29 March 2000* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Papers Submitted

1. It is hereby acknowledged that the following papers have been received and placed of record in the file: Information Disclosure Statement on 06/19/00.

Specification

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it uses legal phraseology ("comprise"). Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

4. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means," "comprise," and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informality: a "Summary of the Invention" section has not been included. Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

6. Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings

are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

7. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "230" has been used to designate both the -execution unit-- and the --I/O interface--. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

8. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "250" has been used to designate both the --Register File-- and the --second I/O bus--. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

9. Claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities: the word "computing" in line 1 of claim 10 should be changed to --calculating-- in order to comply with the language of claim 8 from which claim 10 depends. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claims 1-4, 8-11, and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Austin et al., U.S. Patent Number 3,163,850 (herein referred to as Austin).

12. Referring to claim 1, Austin has taught a method for performing a gather operation on a computer processor comprising:

a. computing addresses for one or more data elements of a matrix stored in a memory (Austin column 5, lines 49-70 and figure 1, address adder 103 with inputs: increment value 101 and start address 52);

b. loading each of said data elements into separate storage locations (Austin column 5, lines 49-73); and

c. depositing each of said data elements contiguously in a single storage location (Austin column 5, lines 49-73).

Further, it can be seen from Austin column 1, lines 10-24, column 2, lines 56-57 and column 6, lines 40-42 that Austin expressly discloses the scattering RSV instruction while not fully disclosing the details of the gathering RGV instruction since it is simply the inverse of the fully disclosed scattering RSV instruction.

13. Referring to claims 2 and 15, Austin has taught the method and the computer system wherein said storage locations are registers (Austin column 1, lines 25-35, column 5, lines 49-73 and figure 1, elements 19, 52, 75. It should also be noted that the basic data storage unit is a register and would inherently be used to store these data elements).

14. Referring to claims 3 and 16, Austin has taught the method and the computer system wherein computing addresses comprises:

a. extracting indices for each of said data elements into separate storage locations (Austin column 5, lines 62-70 and figure 1, increment value 101 acting as a calculated index); and

b. adding each of said indices to a base address (Austin column 5, lines 62-70 and figure 1, address adder 103 and start address 52 which acts as a base address.).

15. Referring to claims 4 and 17, Austin has taught the method and the computer system wherein depositing each of said data elements is accomplished via a DEPOSIT instruction executed by said computer processor (Austin column 1, lines 51-57, column 5, lines 49-55 where Austin's RGV instruction corresponds to applicant's DEPOSIT instruction. Further, it can be seen from Austin column 1, lines 56-57 and column 6, lines 40-42 that Austin expressly discloses the scattering RSV instruction while not fully disclosing the details of the gathering RGV instruction since it is simply the inverse of the fully disclosed scattering RSV instruction.).

16. Referring to claim 8, Austin has taught a method for performing a scatter operation on a computer processor comprising:

a. calculating addresses in memory to which a plurality of data elements are to be scattered to form a matrix in memory (Austin column 5, lines 49-70 and figure 1, address adder 103 with inputs: increment value 101 and start address 52);

b. extracting each of said data elements from a separate storage location in which said elements are stored contiguously (Austin column 5, lines 49-73); and

c. storing said data elements to said addresses in memory (Austin column 5, lines 49-73).

17. Referring to claim 9, Austin has taught the method wherein said storage locations are registers (Austin column 1, lines 25-35, column 5, lines 49-73 and figure 1, elements 19, 52, 75. It should also be noted that the basic data storage unit is a register and would inherently be used to store these data elements).

18. Referring to claim 10, Austin has taught the method wherein computing addresses comprises:

a. extracting indices for each of said data elements into separate storage locations (Austin column 5, lines 62-70 and figure 1, increment value 101 acting as a calculated index); and

b. adding each of said indices to a base address (Austin column 5, lines 62-70 and figure 1, address adder 103 and start address 52 which acts as a base address.).

19. Referring to claim 11, Austin has taught the method wherein extracting each of said data elements is accomplished via an EXTRACT instruction executed by said computer processor (Austin column 5, lines 49-55 where Austin's RSV instruction corresponds to applicant's EXTRACT instruction.).

20. Referring to claim 14, Austin has taught a computer system comprising:

a. a memory (Austin figure 1, memory 16);

b. a processor communicatively coupled to the memory (Austin figure 1, all elements beside memory 16 comprise the processor); and

c. a storage device communicatively coupled to the processor and having stored therein a sequence of instructions (Austin figure 1, memory 16 and column 1, lines 10-35) which, when executed by the processor, causes the processor to at least,

1. compute addresses for one or more data elements of a matrix stored in memory (Austin column 5, lines 49-70 and figure 1, address adder 103 with inputs: increment value 101 and start address 52);

2. load each of said data elements into separate storage locations (Austin column 5, lines 49-73); and

3. deposit each of said data elements contiguously in a single storage location (Austin column 5, lines 49-73).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

21. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

22. Claims 5, 7, 12, 13, 18, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Austin et al., U.S. Patent Number 3,163,850 (herein referred to as Austin).

23. Referring to claims 5 and 18, Austin has not disclosed the method nor the computer system wherein said computer processor executes multiple DEPOSIT instructions in a single clock cycle. However, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement this scatter method in a modern superscalar computer system having an IPC (instructions per clock) of less than 1. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this in order to have a faster and more efficient processing system.

24. Referring to claims 7, 13, and 20, Austin has not disclosed the method nor the computer system wherein said registers are 64-bits wide and said data elements are 16-bits in length. However, at the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to store data elements of 16-bits length in 64-bit wide registers, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

25. Referring to claim 12, Austin has not disclosed the method wherein said computer processor executes multiple EXTRACT instructions in a single clock cycle. However, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement this scatter method in a modern superscalar computer system having an IPC (instructions per clock) of less than 1. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this in order to have a faster and more efficient processing system.

26. Claims 6 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Austin et al., U.S. Patent Number 3,163,850 (herein referred to as Austin) in view of McDonnell et al., U.S. Patent Number 2,968,027 (herein referred to as McDonnell).

27. Referring to claims 6 and 19, McDonnell has taught the method and the computer system further comprising storing each of said data elements on a mass storage device (McDonnell column 7, lines 23-28 and figure 1a, tape units 1-6). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a mass storage device as McDonnell has disclosed in the gather-scatter system Austin has disclosed. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to use a more modern mass storage device –

such as a hard disk, etc. – as opposed to McDonnell's tape units. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this portion of McDonnell's system into Austin's system because Austin repeatedly points a reader of his patent to McDonnell's system as the basis of his system (Austin column 1, lines 19-24, column 2, lines 33-38 and 45-46, column 3, lines 56-57).

Conclusion

28. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. King et al., U.S. Patent Number 3,395,397, have taught another gather-scatter memory system.

b. Lovercheck et al., U.S. Patent Number 3,973,244, have taught a system utilizing gather-write and read-scatter operations in conjunction with disc memory.

c. Thatte, U.S. Patent Number 5,008,786, has taught a system that utilizes a gather-scatter system specifically for the purpose of enhanced performance (see specifically column 13, lines 5-20).

c. The article, "Overlapped Peripheral Block Transfer Unit" from the IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin, Vol. 8, Issue 12, pages 1734-1735 has taught of gathering and scattering data to or from noncontiguous locations in memory.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott M. Collins whose telephone number is 703.305.7865. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie P. Chan can be reached on 703.305.9712. The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703.746.7239 for regular communications and 703.746.7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703.305.3900.

smc
December 13, 2002

EDDIE CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100